final overthrow and rejection of the former method.

We trust that this brief preliminary statement does not seem dull, pedantic, or unmeaning; because it really involves the whole secret, if secret there be, of the formation of the Gothic style. The Romanesque carried out its stubborn system of horizontality for many, many centuries,—in the Basilican, the Byzantine, the Norman styles,—until at length, some time in the twelfth, a *tendency* to relax it was thrown in,—perhaps by accident, perhaps forced by circumstances,—but certainly acknowledged, accepted, and acted upon; the motive being, not the discovery of the pointed arch,—nothing can be a greater mistake than to imagine this,—but *the discovery of the suitableness of the pointed form* to the requirements, the now urgent requirements, of an enlarged system of church architecture.

The *application*, therefore, of a feature which had been not only known, but actually in occasional use, for centuries, the pointed arch, was the real era of the invention, or rather the development, of the gothic style. How its application was first perceived, it is very curious and instructive to observe.

The ancient church architects possessed an extraordinary sagacity in seizing upon a good idea, seeing through its capabilities, and fearlessly carrying it out to its legitimate results, however far it might lead them. They did not care how exorbitant its demands might be; if it *was* a good idea, and would stand the working out, they let it have its way, and made the most reckless concessions to its necessities. They overturned a whole primary principle; surrendered every prejudice, every radical propensity, every cherished idea, to humour it, and to satisfy its extravagant caprices. They knew its merits, and foresaw that they should get right in the end by following it out, even though a good many difficulties, some bungling experiments, and occasional failures, were to be encountered in the process.

So with the adoption of the pointed arch. It was like inserting a wedge into a crevice, which must end in the disruption of the mass, while yet the conscious workman still plies the hammer to drive it more and more home.

The gothic style commences with what is commonly called the Transition period; an intermediate point, which is justly considered to involve almost the only *sudden* change in the whole history of a strictly progressive art, from its earliest to its latest existence. Sudden it certainly must be called, because the entire duration of the mixed style, from the first infringement of the Romanesque to the final establishment of the pointed principle, was only for about thirty years, at the utmost. It was the critical point at which the art took a new turn, and made a mighty effort; and after a thirty years' struggle gained a complete, a glorious, a decisive victory. A style truly original, and hitherto totally unknown, was thus produced, and even fully matured, within the limits of that very brief but very active period of church building. In 1170, the Norman tower and western transepts of Ely Cathedral were in course of erection; in 1180, the Norman Galilee porch at Durham was built; in 1202, the eastern parts of Winchester; and in 1215, the western porch of Ely Cathedral were completed, both of the most perfect and well developed pointed style. And yet, in 1138, the abbey church of Buildwas, Salop, which is early Norman work with *pointed* arches, was finished. How can we reasonably argue that the discovery of the pointed arch was the direct cause of the gothic style, when the Romanesque was still prevalent in England for nearly half a century after that feature had been fairly introduced into the architecture of the country?

If we consider carefully the real differences between Norman architecture with the semicircular arch, and the same with the general or partial use of the pointed, commonly called semi-Norman, or Transition, we shall not fail to notice the following facts, which we will afterwards briefly follow out to their results in the complete gothic styles:—

1. That there is not any essential or radical difference in respect of detail, but only such as consists in modification. For the ornaments, mouldings, capitals, and columns, arcades and pilasters, are often actually identical in both styles; and are certainly never so materially different as *alone* to constitute a new kind of architecture.

2. That the proportions were more altered than the details in the progress of the change from the round to the pointed style; as by a manifest elongation, increased lightness, and subdivision of parts, by which the Romanesque was gradually prepared for the reception of the pointed arch, when the due time for its adoption arrived.

3. That the intermixture, or accidental and indiscriminate use of pointed arches with semicircular, does not so far change the character of a Romanesque building, as to attach to it the distinctive character of gothic. For instance, the naves of Fountains, of Buildwas and Malmesbury Abbeys, and of the Temple Church, have pointed arches, for the most part springing from pure Norman columns, and immediately surmounted by purely Norman semi-circular arches, either in the triforium or clerestory. On the other hand, the nave of Oxford Cathedral has semi-circular nave-arches, and early pointed clerestory windows. Kirkstall Abbey, and St. Cross Hospital, Hampshire, have also pointed nave-arches, with all the main features of Romanesque work, and little or nothing of gothic character about them.

4. That the immediate result of pointing an arch is to give a much greater height in proportion to the breadth between its two piers or columns, than would be obtained by a semicircular arch, borne by the same supporting masses.

5. That in attempting to gain the same lofty effects, the late Romanesque builders, as we know from documents and existing vestiges, uniformly heightened their columns by adding to or rebuilding the earlier ones; by which means the relative proportion between the arch and its pier was frequently sacrificed.

6. That the breaking up of solid and heavy masses into parts, by distributing the thrusts and weights in various divergent directions, borne by isolated members at various heights, was the first process of disintegration, by which multiplicity and minuteness of parts were produced out of vast, few, and heavy constructive features.

7. That the real criterion of a pointed building, properly so called, consists in the use of pointed arches in the vaulting; because in this case the contiguous side-arches are pointed by necessity to suit the vaulting, and no longer by caprice, that is, without particular relation to other and ulterior parts of construction.

8. That it was not the *discovery* of the pointed arch (which must be nearly as old as the use of a pair of compasses), that caused the introduction of the Gothic style, so much as it was the germinating and expanding principles of vertical ascension, which enforced the general adoption of the pointed arch; a feature already well known, and long practised in the architecture of many countries and several independent formations.

Let us now reconsider the above facts, in reference to the principles which they involve, and the results which they at length brought about.

1. It is clear, that as details form the decorative part of architecture, the adjuncts rather than the essentials of any style, they have not in themselves sufficient preponderance to constitute that actual contrariety of radical principles which distinguishes all Gothic from all Romanesque work. The utmost which even the completest change of details can effect, is to second and aid the development of new principles. This will be readily conceded by all; and it is perfectly easy to illustrate it by adducing instances on the one hand of early Gothic details co-existent with decidedly Norman outlines and primary features, as in St. Joseph's Chapel at Glastonbury; and on the other of gothic principles, such as pointed arches, either plain and massive almost to rudeness, or relieved and enriched by purely Norman ornaments, as the chevron, the beak-head, &c. Thus in the nave of Barneck Church, and the west front of St. Leonard's Priory, near Stamford, we have semicircular arches, mixed up with a great deal of first-pointed, or early English detail; and there are countless doorways, chancel-arches, &c., in existence, which are Gothic in all except the detail, which is Romanesque. Thus it appears that, although this incongruity between principles and details is a natural mark of a transition style, yet it is the former rather than the latter which constitutes the real difference between the old and the new; and that difference of details is rather an accident in both, only casually connected with their particular stage of development.

2. Although Norman details continued in all their original quaintness till fully as late as 1180, still buildings of that era are always marked by two decided tendencies to Gothicism,—lightness and elongation; that is, increased height with decreased bulk or diameter. This is very observable, even where the semicircular arch is still retained with all the Norman decorations. The complex wall-pier, with its surrounding nook-shafts and jagged rectangular capital, is now changed into the taper cylindrical column of perfectly gothic proportion, of which the north side of the nave at Barneck, the Galilee porch at Durham, the churches of Bourn, near Cambridge, Witham on the Hill, Lincolnshire, and Becket's Crown at Canterbury, &c., are examples; and the capital is much reduced in size by having the corners of the square cut off, so as to exhibit the octagonal shape. It is on these capitals that we first see an approximation to Corinthian foliage, which soon after was matured into the umbrageous luxuriance of the next style. The notion of greater height and slimness having been attained, it was found that the pointed arch surmounted these columns with much more propriety, convenience, and effect, than the semicircular form, because it much better preserved the dignity of relative proportion.

3. That many Norman buildings have the pointed arch, and yet remain Norman, is undeniable. The nave of Fountains Abbey, already cited, is as thoroughly Norman as any building can possibly be; and yet it has long ranges of equilateral arches on both sides of the nave. The western towers of Durham Cathedral have alternately Norman and early English arcades in several tiers one above the other; so also the great western tower at Ely has pointed and round arches similarly intermixed, and indiscriminately used; and the west fronts of Croyland, of Byland, and of Malton Abbey Church, Yorkshire, are of much the same composition. In these, and many such buildings, had all the arches been pointed, or all semicircular, it would be unsafe to assert that they would themselves have thereby become either more or less Romanesque than they now are. The pointed arch could not, on the contrary supposition, have been so long co-existent with the pure Norman style without superseding or overthrowing it.

4. The use of the pointed arch, however, operated extensively in two ways, which are completely Gothic; it imparted additional height without additional breadth, and afforded the very important facility of attaining the same height with different widths, i.e. greater or less span, or breadth. It converted, as it were, a square into a parallelogram set on end, and so far turned that which was as much horizontal as vertical into vertical predominating over horizontal. The former principle was immediately carried out to a considerable excess in arcading, where the shafts are often placed very close together, and support extremely tall, and yet extremely acute and narrow arches. Now in Norman arcades, the principal mural ornament of the style, when the shafts are placed, as they often are, very close together, no effect is gained but that of crowding, because the semi-circular arch is as much lower as it is narrower; and thus the due proportion, invariably observed in the Gothic, between the arch and the bearing-shaft, is totally sacrificed when the arcaded space is of considerable height.

5. The springing off of slender side-arches, forming groin-ribs to vaults, at right angles to the main row of nave-arches, introduced a principle which went far to overthrow the Norman style. To support this groin-rib, at first thrown off, as it were, from a spare ledgement of the capital behind or in front of the nave column, a small adherent shaft was soon added to the main pillar, forming the first element of the clustered, or complex Gothic column. This may be seen in its simplest state in the nave of Fountains Abbey, the transept at Ely, and the triforium of St. Sepulchre's, Cambridge; where the ribs which support the aisle-vault rest awkwardly on the capitals of the main columns, without any attached bear-

To learn about PDF Compression and OCR go to ThePaperlessOffice.org